

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/763,106	02/16/2001	Martin Sugar	BEIERSDORF 7	3482	
7	590 01/28/2003				
Norris McLaughlin & Marcus 220 East 42nd Street 30th Floor			EXAMINER		
			BERMAN, ALYSIA		
New York, NY 10017		•	ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/763,106	SCHMUCKER ET AL.
, avious notion	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alysia Berman	1617
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with th	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 23 December 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (*condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of		
b) LJ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee efee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) \square they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE: the proposed amendment to claim 13 wa	s not previously presented or cons	idered.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s)would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See	r reconsideration has been cons <u>e Continuation Sheet</u> .	sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b ould be rejected is provided belo)∏ will be entered and an ow or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 7-18.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
10. ☐ Other:		
		RUSSELL TRAVERS PRIMAR FAXAMMER GHZUP 1200

alperto

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claims are rejected for reasons of record in the Office Action mailed September 23, 2002, paper no. 11. Applicant has not provided any data of record showing absolute and complete inhibition of the attachment of lauryl ether sulfate to the skin. One of ordinary skill in the art would expect surfactants such as lauryl ether sulfate to bind to liophilic substances such as those contained in human skin. Therefore, Applicant's assertion of prevention of attachment of lauryl ether sulfate to the skin is speculative and is not supported by the specification as filed. Applicant appears to be arguing limitations that are not in the claims. i.e. elimination or reduction in the irritant potential of sodium lauryl ether sulfate. The motivation to combine the references is as dicussed in paper no. 11..

2